

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 23877 OF 2017
DECIDED ON: OCTOBER 24, 2017

SAHAB RAM

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. A.S. Sidhu, Advocate for
Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to disburse/release the ACP's revised pensionary benefits along with interest @ 12% per annum from the date of actual retirement.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that though a legal notice dated 05.09.2017 (Annexure P-3) was duly served upon the respondents but till date no conscious decision has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is issued to respondents to decide the aforesaid legal notice within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent(s)

to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his legal notice dated 05.09.2017 (Annexure P-3) and to decide the same, in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the concerned authority comes to the conclusion that petitioner is entitled to the relief claimed through aforesaid legal notice, to release the same within a period of next 1 month. The factum of interest shall also be considered in view of the observations made by Full Bench of this Court in case captioned as ***“R.S. Randhawa vs. State of Punjab, 1997 (3) RSJ 318.***

4. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

OCTOBER 24, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***